REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is made to clarify the function, use and objective of the semantic evaluation meta-data recited in the claims, thereby improving the definition of this term, consistent with the specification.

Claims 69-71, 73-77, 79, 80 and 82 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-68, 72, 78 and 81 were canceled previously. Claims 69-71, 74, 77 and 80 are independent, and are amended in this response. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification.

Method claims 69, 71, 73, 77 and 79 were rejected under 35 USC 101, based upon the current interpretation by the Office of *In re Bilski*. These claims are amended to recite the specific apparatus to which the methods defined by claims 69, 71, 73, 77 and 79 are tied. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Claims 69-71, 74, 75, 77 and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 once again, as being obvious in view of the combination of Goldberg (U.S. Patent 5,963,203), Abecassis (U.S. Patent 5,724,472) and Maquire (U.S. Patent 5,995,941). This combination has been discussed in previous amendments; and the deficiencies of these references relative to Applicant's claims have been pointed out before. Rather than repeat Applicant's earlier arguments, which are still applicable, reference is made to Applicant's amendments filed

December 9, 2005, March 31, 2006, October 6, 2006, December 18, 2006, January 17, 2007, May 25, 2007, September 17, 2007 and January 27, 2009.

Claims 73, 76, 79, and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Goldberg, Abecassis and Maquire, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,555 (Hjelsvold).

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted May 27, 2009. During the interview, the prior art rejections were discussed; and Applicant's representative pointed out the differences between, for example, amended independent claim 69 and the combined teachings of the prior art.

One objective of the present invention is to generate a video preview, recited in the claims as a summary digest video preview, of the content of the main video data by using the semantic evaluation meta-data that indicates the impact or significance on the story, or content, of the main video data of particular shots or scenes. Those shots having important significance, based on, for example, their respective semantic scores, are extracted from the main video data and linked to display the video preview formed of a sequence of those extracted shots. The user can obtain a clear understanding of the main video content from the resultant video preview and thereby determine whether or not he wants to view the entire video content. Thus, the user need not view an entire program or movie or other content, simply to conclude that he is not interested in that content.

In applying Goldberg to Applicant's claims, the Examiner interpreted Goldberg's "information regarding… cuts" as semantic evaluation meta-data (see page 2 of the Office Action under reply). However, as the Examiner acknowledged, Goldberg's "information regarding cuts" does not include evaluation values of each shot of the main video, nor does it

have a value that measures the relevance of a shot to represent the impact or significance of that shot in the development of the main video content. The Examiner further acknowledged that Goldberg does not use his "information regarding cuts" to extract shots from the main video data and to form a sequence of those extract shots, thereby constituting a preview of the main video content.

As discussed in the amendment filed January 27, 2009, Goldberg relates to interactive interfaces for video information providing a displayed view of a quasi-object called a root image. The root image consists of a plurality of basic frames selected from the video information, arranged such that their respective x and y directions are aligned with the x and y directions in the root image and the z direction in the root image corresponds to time, such that base frames are spaced apart in the z direction of the root image in accordance with their time separation. The displayed view of the root image changes in accordance with a designated viewing position, as if the root image were a three-dimensional object. The user can manipulate the displayed image by designating different viewing positions, selecting portions of the video information for playback and by special effects, such as cutting open the quasi-object for a better view. A toolkit permits interface designers to design such interfaces, notably so as to control the types of interaction which will be possible between the interface and an end user. Implementations of the interfaces may include editors and viewers. Clearly, this is unrelated to Applicant's claimed semantic evaluation meta-data.

Abecassis was relied upon for allegedly describing semantic evaluation meta-data that measures the relevance of a shot and that is used for extracting shots from main video data. But that portion of Abecassis cited by the Examiner describes program content rating for the purpose of identifying shots or scenes having objectionable content. Based upon the rating of a

particular shot, that shot is excised from the video content displayed to the user. As a result, rather than displaying a preview video formed of a sequence of linked shots that are extracted, Abecassis discards the extracted shots (see column 9, lines 8-28). Furthermore, even if Abecassis was to link his excised shots, the resultant certainly would not enable the user to obtain an understanding of the main video data from those excised shots. Indeed, the purpose of Abecassis is to prevent the user from seeing the extracted shots.

Maquire is directed to a correlation tool that correlates an audience reaction to different portions of a speaker's presentation (col. 1, lines 44-45). Dial-type controls provide the audience reaction to the presentation; and signals from the audience meters are "correlated by time with the video signal and the audio signal" of the presentation (col. 3, lines 29-35). Statistical analysis of the meter signals can determine points of interest, such as low points, in the presentation (col. 4, lines 7-12). The segments of the video having meter signals of interest can be parsed to create summary video having only segments which are of interest to the presenter (col. 5, lines 56-60). The meter signals are not "meta-data." Nor are the segments parsed by Maquire a video preview from which a user can obtain an understanding of the main video content. Indeed, even the presenter who might view the parsed segments would not gain an understanding of the main video from those segments.

Claim 69 recites, *inter alia*:

> "obtaining semantic evaluation meta-data including evaluation values of each shot or scene of the main video data, said semantic evaluation meta-data having a value that measures the relevance of a shot or scene and representing the impact or significance of the shot or scene in the development of the content represented by the main video data; and
>
> transmitting, by a signal transmitter, the identifying data, the semantic evaluation meta-data, and the main video data, wherein the identifying data and the semantic evaluation meta-data are used for extracting shots or scenes from the main video data, based on the relevance of the extracted shots as represented by the value of said semantic evaluation

meta-data, for a user to link said extracted shots to display a summary digest video preview formed of a sequence of said extracted shots, which is a preview of said content, whereby the user can obtain an understanding of the content of said main video data from said preview of said content." (Emphasis added)

As discussed above, neither Goldberg nor Abecassis nor Maquire is suggestive of the aforequoted, emphasized features recited by claim and 69. Therefore, in view of the significant differences between Applicant's claim 69 and the cumulative teachings of Goldberg, Abecassis and Maquire, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 69 is patentable over this combination of references.

Claim 70 is directed to the transmitter that performs the method defined by claim 69 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 71 and 74 are the corresponding receiving method and receiver, respectively, and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 77 and 80 are the corresponding transmitting/receiving method and transmission/reception system, respectively, and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. The addition of Hjelsvold provides no teaching of the semantic evaluation meta-data and the use of that meta-data, as recited in claims 73, 76, 79 and 82 by reason of the dependencies of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and requests early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800